



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,899	12/16/2005	Hisashi Suda	12065-0038	2434
22502	7590	12/03/2008	EXAMINER	
CLARK & BRODY			CORNQ JR, JAMES A	
1090 VERNONT AVENUE, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 250			1793	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/560,899	Applicant(s) SUDA ET AL.
	Examiner JAMES CORNO	Art Unit 1793

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/24/2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 and 4-12 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1 and 4-12 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/0256/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer filed on September 24, 2008, disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of any patent granted on application number 11/186,957 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 24, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. All of the references teach compounds with compositions essentially identical to those of the instant claims.

Regarding applicant's arguments against the rejection based on Ogura, the disclosure indicates that the desorption of NO results in the ignition of soot. It also gives an example of a compound with sodium present (working example 2) that has an ignition temperature well below 400°C. It is therefore assumed that the presence of sodium does not raise the adsorption domain beyond the claimed range of 200-450°C.

Regarding applicant's arguments against the rejections based on Abe and Matsumoto, applicant has presented no objective evidence that the use of amorphous components results in a materially different product. In the present specification (pg 7), use of amorphous components is just one example of the method that can be used to make the oxide. The present specification suggests that the claimed NO adsorption

domain range is a property of the perovskite-type composite oxide and not determined by the particular method by which the oxide is made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Abe et al (JP 01307452 A). Abe teaches a perovskite catalyst compound of the formula $\text{La}_{0.8}\text{Sr}_{0.2}\text{CoO}_3$ for use in a diesel exhaust particulate filter (abstract) that does not contain sodium. Abe does not teach the use of amorphous precursors. However, the present specification indicates that the amorphous precursor method is one of several methods that will yield the desired NO adsorption range, and no comparison is made with the other methods. The catalyst of Abe is therefore assumed to be identical to that of the instant claims.

In the event any differences can be shown for the product of the product-by-process claims 1 and 4-12, as opposed to the product taught by Abe, such differences would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a routine modification of the product in the absence of a showing of unexpected results; see also *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985).

When the prior art discloses a product which reasonably appears to be either identical with or only slightly different than a product claimed in a product-by-process claim, a rejection based alternatively on either section 102 or 103 of the statute is appropriate. As a practical matter, the Patent and Trademark Office is not equipped to manufacture products by the myriad of processes put before it and then obtain prior art products and make physical comparisons therewith. A lesser burden of proof is required to make out a case of *prima facie* obviousness for product-by-process claims because of their particular nature than when a product is claimed in the conventional fashion. *In re Brown*, 59 CCPA 1063, 173 USPQ 685 (1972); *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324 (CCPA 1974).

Claims 1 and 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishii et al (US Patent No. 5,503,815). Ishii teaches a perovskite composite oxide of the form $(La_{1-x}Sr_x)_yMnO_z$ where $x \leq 0.5$, $0.8 \leq y \leq 1$, and $2.5 \leq z \leq 3$, formed by making a solution of carbonates of La, Sr, and Mn, precipitating a precursor by the addition of ammonium carbonate or ammonium bicarbonate, and calcining the precipitate (Claim 1, examples). Ishii does not specifically teach that the precursor is amorphous. However,

the precursor is assumed to be amorphous because it is produced in an identical method to that presented by the applicant (i.e. precipitation induced by the addition of a carbonate of ammonia). Ishii also does not specifically teach the claimed NO adsorption domain. However, the material is structurally identical and produced by identical means. The adsorption domain is therefore assumed to be an inherent property of the material.

Ishii does not teach the use of the perovskite compound in a diesel particulate filter. However, Ishii teaches that one intended use of the compound is as a catalyst. The use of perovskite compounds in diesel particulate filters is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the perovskite compound taught by Ishii as a catalyst in a diesel particulate filter with a reasonable expectation of success.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES CORNO whose telephone number is (571)270-5829. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Melvin Curtis Mayes can be reached on 571-272-1234. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JAMES CORNO/
Examiner, Art Unit 1793

/Melvin Curtis Mayes/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793